

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed March 22, 2005. In order to advance prosecution of this case, Applicants amend Claims 6, 19, 33, and 47. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

Section 103 Rejections

The Examiner rejects Claims 1-56 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,502,213 issued to Bowman-Amuah (“*Bowman*”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,671,508 issued to Mitsuoka et al. (“*Mitsuoka*”).

Claim 1 recites:

A method for accessing a database, comprising the steps of:
receiving a first request in a first format compatible with a public network communication protocol;
converting the first request to a second request, the second request in a second format compatible with a repository protocol;
transmitting the second request to a repository;
receiving from the repository a first response in the second format, the first response including control information and requested information;
converting the first response to a second response, the second response in the first format and the second response including the control information and the requested information; and
transmitting the second response to a client to be provided by the client in a manner determined by at least the control information.

Bowman and *Mitsuoka*, both alone and in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest every element of Claim 1 for at least several reasons. First, the proposed *Bowman-Mitsuoka* combination fails to disclose “receiving from the repository a first response in the second format, the first response including control information and requested information” as recited by Claim 1. Applicants respectfully note that the Examiner fails to address this element in rejecting Claim 1. With respect to “control information”, however, the Examiner concedes that “[*Bowman*] does not explicitly indicate the control information.” *Office Action*, p. 4. Thus, *Bowman* fails to disclose “receiving from the repository a first response in the second format, the first response including control information and requested information” as recited by Claim 1.

Mitsuoka does not remedy this omission as *Mitsuoka* also fails to disclose “receiving from the repository a first response in the second format, the first response including control information and requested information.” With respect to *Mitsuoka*, the Examiner asserts that “[*Mitsuoka* teaches the control information (Col 7, Lines 9-29, i.e. additional information; see also Col 8, Lines 16-35; see also Col 11, Lines 50-62; see also Figure No. 21 and corresponding text; see also Figure No. 11 and corresponding text)]” *Office Action*, p. 4, footnotes omitted. Applicants respectfully dispute the Examiner’s characterization of the “additional information” disclosed by *Mitsuoka*. Nonetheless, even accepting for the sake of argument that the Examiner has accurately described the additional information of *Mitsuoka*, *Mitsuoka* does not disclose that the additional information is “received from the repository,” or that the additional information is “received . . . [in] “a first response [that includes] control information and requested information.” Thus, *Mitsuoka* and *Bowman*, both alone and in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest “receiving from the repository a first response in the second format, the first response including control information and requested information” as recited by Claim 1.

Second, the proposed *Bowman-Mitsuoka* combination fails to disclose “transmitting the second response to a client to be provided by the client in a manner determined by at least the control information” as recited by Claim 1. As the Examiner concedes, “[*Bowman*] does not explicitly indicate the control information.” *Office Action*, p. 4. Thus, *Bowman* also fails to disclose “transmitting the second response to a client to be provided by the client in a manner determined by at least the control information.”

Combination with *Mitsuoka* fails to remedy this omission as *Mitsuoka* also fails to disclose “transmitting the second response to a client to be provided by the client in a manner determined by at least the control information.” With respect to *Mitsuoka*, the Examiner states only that “[t]he Examiner would like to respectfully bring the Applicant attention to the citation of *Mitsuoka*, Col 22, Lines 28-36, wherein the manner determined by the control information is similar to having a user determining a communication service and wherein the conditions must be satisfied.” *Office Action*, p. 4, footnote 2. Applicants respectfully dispute these assertions. In particular, Applicants respectfully note that the cited portion of *Mitsuoka* discloses that “[i]t is also possible to allow a user to register conditions, such that *timings for sending a user status* are determined as when the conditions has been satisfied.” Col. 22, ll.

28-31. Thus, in the system disclosed by *Mitsuoka*, satisfaction of the conditions merely determines the timings for sending a user status. *Mitsuoka* does not disclose that any request “to be provided by the client in a manner determined by at least the control information” as recited by Claim 1.

As a result, both *Bowman* and *Mitsuoka* fail to disclose every element of Claim 1. Claim 1 is thus allowable for at least these reasons. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claim 1 and its dependents.

Additionally, several dependents of Claim 1 are allowable for additional reasons. For example, Claim 6 recites:

The method of Claim 1, wherein the client comprises a telephone, the requested information includes a telephone number, and the control information includes an autodial indicator, wherein the autodial indicator indicates whether the telephone permits automatic dialing of the telephone number, and wherein transmitting the second response to a client comprises transmitting the second response to the telephone to be used to display the telephone number and to determine an autodial status of the telephone number.

The proposed *Bowman-Mitsuoka* combination also fails to disclose, teach, or suggest every element of amended Claim 6. The Examiner asserts that “*Bowman* discloses displaying of a telephone number (*Bowman*, Col 60, Line 45); in edition [sic], *Mitsuoka* also discloses displaying of a telephone number and autodial status (Figure 24 and corresponding text).” *Office Action*, p. 5, footnotes omitted. Additionally, the Examiner asserts that “the ‘autodial status’ is being interpreted as a ‘communication status’ for example (see Figure 24, i.e. communication status)[.]” *Office Action*, p. 5, footnote 5. Applicants respectfully note that to whatever extent *Mitsuoka* discloses “displaying of a telephone number” as the Examiner asserts, *Mitsuoka* does not disclose “the control information includes an autodial indicator, wherein the autodial status indicates whether the telephone permits automatic dialing of the telephone number” as recited by amended Claim 1. As *Mitsuoka* notes, the communication status describes a characteristic or characteristic of *another user* and may include statuses such as “‘All’, ‘Within Area’, ‘Outside Area or Turned Off’, ‘Line Busy’, and ‘Callable’.” Col. 27, ll. 57-60, emphasis added. *Mitsuoka* does not however disclose an autodial status “wherein the autodial status indicates whether the telephone permits automatic dialing of the telephone number” as recited by amended Claim 6.

In rejecting this element, the Examiner is silent with respect to *Bowman*. *Bowman*, however, also fails to disclose this element. As a result, the proposed *Bowman-Mitsuoka* combination fails to disclose “control information [that] includes an autodial indicator, wherein the autodial status indicates whether the telephone permits automatic dialing of the telephone number.”

Thus, the proposed *Bowman-Mitsuoka* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest at least this additional limitation of amended Claim 6. Claim 6 is thus allowable for at least this additional reason. As noted above, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claim 6.

As another example, Claim 7 recites:

The method of Claim 1, wherein the requested information includes a telephone number, and wherein the control information is used by the client to determine which digits of the telephone number to display.

The proposed *Bowman-Mitsuoka* combination also fails to disclose, teach, or suggest every element of amended Claim 7. The Examiner asserts that “*Bowman* discloses displaying of a telephone number (*Bowman*, Col 60, Line 45); in edition [sic], *Mitsuoka* also discloses displaying of a telephone number and autodial status (Figure 24 and corresponding text).” *Office Action*, p. 5, footnotes omitted. To whatever extent this may be true, neither *Bowman* nor *Mitsuoka* discloses that the control information is used by the client “to determine which digits of the telephone number to display” as recited by Claim 7.

As a result, the proposed *Bowman-Mitsuoka* combination also fails to disclose, teach, or suggest at least this additional element of amended Claim 7. Claim 7 is thus allowable for at least this additional reason. As noted above, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claim 7.

Although Claims 14, 27, 42, and 55 differ in scope from Claim 1, Claims 14, 27, 42, and 55 include elements that, for reasons substantially similar to those discussed above with respect to Claim 1, are not disclosed, taught, or suggested by the cited references. Claims 14, 27, 42, and 55 are thus allowable for at least these reasons. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claims 14, 27, 42, and 55, and their respective dependents.

Claim 8 recites:

A method for accessing a database, comprising the steps of:
receiving a first request in a first format compatible with a public network communication protocol, the request including save information;

converting the first request to a second request, the second request in a second format compatible with a repository protocol;

transmitting the second request to a repository to store the save information;

receiving from the repository a response in the second format; and

transmitting an update notification to a client indicating the save information has been updated, in response to receiving the response from the repository.

Bowman and *Mitsuoka*, both alone and in combination, fail to disclose every element of Claim 8. For example, the proposed *Bowman-Mitsuoka* combination fails to disclose “transmitting an update notification to a client indicating the save information has been updated, in response to receiving the response from the repository.” As the Examiner concedes *Bowman* “does not explicitly indicate the save information.” *Office Action*, p. 7. Thus, *Bowman* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least “transmitting an update notification to a client indicating the save information has been updated, in response to receiving the response from the repository.”

Combination with *Mitsuoka* fails to remedy this omission, as *Mitsuoka* also fails to disclose the relevant limitation. With respect to *Mitsuoka*, the Examiner asserts that “the Examiner is interpreting the ‘save information’ to be the ‘user status’ (see *Mitsuoka*, Col 12, Line 64 through Col 13, Line 9), as the status is being stored (saved) and also being updated (saved) a notification is being sent to the client indicating that the ‘status’ (saved information) has been updated.” *Office Action*, p. 7, footnote 6. Although Applicants respectfully dispute this reading of *Mitsuoka*, to whatever extent it may be true, *Mitsuoka* does not transmit any update notification “in response to receiving the response from the repository.” As the cited portion of *Mitsuoka* clearly indicates, “[o]nce any of the user statuses changes, the sending means sends the new user status to mobile terminals of other users.” Col. 13, ll. 3-4. Thus, the sending means of *Mitsuoka* transmits the user statuses *in response to changes in the user statuses* and not “in response to receiving the response from the repository” as recited by Claim 8.

As a result, the proposed *Bowman-Mitsuoka* combination fails to disclose, teach, or suggest every element of Claim 8. Claim 8 is thus allowable for at least this reason. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claim 8 and its dependents.

Furthermore, several dependents of Claim 8 are allowable for additional reasons. For example, Claim 12 recites:

The method of Claim 8, wherein the save information comprises information identifying a user and a password associated with the user.

The proposed *Bowman-Mitsuoka* combination fails to disclose, teach, or suggest additional elements of Claim 12. For example, as the Examiner concedes *Bowman* “does not explicitly indicate the save information.” *Office Action*, p. 7. Thus, *Bowman* does not disclose that “the save information comprises information identifying a user and a password associated with the user,” regardless of whether *Bowman* discloses generally the concepts of “authentication, password[s] and level[s] of access” as asserted by the Examiner. *Office Action*, p. 8.

Combination with *Mitsuoka* fails to remedy this omission, as *Mitsuoka* also fails to disclose the relevant element. In rejecting Claim 8, the Examiner asserts that “the Examiner is interpreting the ‘save information’ to be the ‘user status’...” *Office Action*, p. 7. To whatever extent this may be an accurate reading of the language of Claim 8 and/or Claim 12, Applicants respectfully note that the user status does not “comprise information identifying a user and a password associated with the user.” Thus, with respect to Claim 12, both *Bowman* and *Mitsuoka* fail to disclose “save information [that] comprises information identifying a user and a password associated with the user” as recited by Claim 12.

As a result, the proposed *Bowman-Mitsuoka* combination fails to disclose, teach, or suggest at least this additional element of Claim 12. Claim 12 is thus allowable for at least this additional reason. As noted above, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claim 12.

As another example, Claim 13 recites:

The method of Claim 8, further comprising:
receiving an update request from the client in response to the update notification; and
transmitting the save information to the client, in response to the update notification.

The proposed Bowman-Mitsuoka combination also fails to disclose, teach, or suggest every element of amended Claim 13. The Examiner asserts that “Bowman discloses receiving requests for update (Col 71, Lines 51-54; see also Col 259, Lines 63-67; see also Col 260, Lines 45-48).” *Office Action*, p. 8. To whatever extent this may be true, *Bowman* fails to disclose any “update notification.” Thus, *Bowman* fails to disclose “receiving an update response from the client in response to the update notification.”

Combination with *Mitsuoka* fails to remedy this omission as *Mitsuoka* also fails to disclose the relevant limitation. With respect to *Mitsuoka*, the Examiner asserts that “as the [user] status is being stored (saved) and also being updated (saved) a notification is being sent to the client indicating that the ‘status’ (saved information) has been updated.” *Office Action*, p. 7. To whatever extent this may be an accurate reading of *Mitsuoka*, *Mitsuoka* clearly indicates that “[o]nce any of the user statuses changes, the sending means sends the new user status to mobile terminals of other users.” Col. 13, ll. 3-4. Thus, the sending means of *Mitsuoka* transmits the new user status *in response to user status changes*, and not “*in response to the update notification*” as recited by amended Claim 13.

As a result, the proposed Bowman-Mitsuoka combination also fails to disclose, teach, or suggest at least this additional element of amended Claim 13. Claim 13 is thus allowable for at least this additional reason. As noted above, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claim 13.

Although Claims 21, 35, 49, and 56 differ in scope from Claim 8, Claims 21, 35, 49, and 56 include elements that, for reasons substantially similar to those discussed above with respect to Claim 8, are not disclosed, taught, or suggested by the cited references. Claims 21, 35, 49, and 56 are thus allowable for at least these reasons. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claims 21, 35, 49, and 56, and their respective dependents.

Conclusions

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons, and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of all pending Claims. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference or an interview would advance prosecution of this Application in any manner, the undersigned attorney for Applicants stands ready to conduct such a conference at the convenience of the Examiner.

No fees are believed to be due, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicants



Todd A. Cason
Reg. No. 54,020

2001 Ross Avenue, Suite 600
Dallas, Texas 75201-2980
(214) 953-6452

Date: 6/22/05

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:

Customer Number:

05073